DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 607 RC 003 823

AUTHOR	Geschwind, R. D.; Ruttan, V. W.
TITLE	Job Mobility and Migration in a Low Income Rural Community. Research Bulletin No. 730
INSTITUTION	Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind. Agricultural Experiment Station.
REPORT NO	R-Bull-730
PUB DATE	Sep 61
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Agricultural Publications Office, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47907
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Analysis, Demography, Economic Disadvantagement, Income, Low Income Counties, Migration Patterns, Models, *Occupational Mobility, *Rural Areas, *Rural Economics, *Rural Population, Social Status, Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

The model developed by Olson and reported in "Job Mobility and Migration in a High Income Rural Community" (RC 003 821) was utilized in this study of the mobility and migration in the low income, rural Shoals, Indiana, community. The data collected in this study were compared to that of the previous study and the conclusions support the usefulness of the model as a hypotheses generating instrument and the results of the previous study. Emphasized were the importance of education for successful mobility, the farmers loss of social status with a job shift, and that mobility and migration were the result of economic and social status factors. (DK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

research bulletin No. 730 Sept. 1961

ED034607

JOB MOBILITY and MIGRATION

in a LOW income rural community

R. D. GESCHWIND AND V. W. RUTTAN
Department of Agricultural Economics



Summary and Conclusions

This report presents information on the factors which influence job mobility and migration in the low income rural community of Shoals in southern Indiana. The results are compared with the findings of a similar study in the high income rural community of Brookston in northern Indiana.

In the Shoals community:

- The migrant was younger and better educated than the non-migrant. The migrant had a high or low rather than a median level income and occupied a high social position in the community.
- A comparison of the job-mobile and the non-mobile individuals showed no difference in age, level of income and education. Mobile individuals did, however, tend to occupy a relatively low social position.
- Individuals who changed occupations had more thorough knowledge of available job opportunities than was characteristic of the non-mobile persons.
- Individuals who changed their community or their occupation tended to have little or no proprietary interest in their place of employment.
- Migration into Shoals by persons with technical and professional skill has complemented

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Agricultural Experiment Station, Lafayette, Indiana

RC003823

migration out of the community by other occupational groups.

Comparison of the Shoals and Brookston communities indicated that:

- Persons with supplementary sources of income tended to be in the high income group in Shoals and in the low income group in Brookston.
- In Brookston former farmers were younger than the current farmers, whereas in Shoals movement out of farming occurred at all age levels.
- In both Brookston and Shoals, movement from farming to local non-farm employment resulted in a decline in social status.
- Individuals in Brookston were more successful in expressing motives for social and economic betterment through job mobility and migration than residents in Shoals.
- In both Brookston and Shoals movement out of agriculture occurred primarily among farmers in the group with lowest gross sales of farm products. More of the former farmers in the Brookston community were tenants than owners. In the Shoals community there were as many former owners as tenants among former farmers.

Contents

	Page
Summary and Conclusions	1
Introduction	2
A Conceptual Framework	4
Conceptual Relationships	4
Occupational Mobility Hypotheses	5
Spatial Mobility Hypotheses	6
Dual Mobility	6
Job Mobility in Shoals Community	7
Personal Factors	7
Motives for Mobility	8
Impediments to Mobility	10
Job Mobility of Farm Workers	11
Motives for Mobility	12
Impediments to Mobility	13
Migration into Shoals Community	13
Dual Mobility	16
Comparison of Shoals and Brookston	17
Comparison of Migrants	17
Comparison of Job Mobility	18
Agricultural Labor Mobility	20
Implications	22
Appendix Tables	23

Foreword

This second study of job mobility and migration represents an attempt to test further the analytical framework and the hypothesis developed in Philip G. Olson, *Job Mobility and Migration in a High Income Rural Community*, Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 708 (November 1960), in a situation characterized by more limited opportunities for successful intra-community expression of motives for economic and social betterment.

A more detailed statement of the research methodology is presented in R. D. Geschwind, *Adjustment of Labor Resources in Indiana Agriculture* (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Purdue University, Department of Agricultural Economics, June 1961). The study was conducted under the guidance of an interdepartmental committee consisting of: J. M. Beshers, Sociology; R. L. Kohls, Agricultural Economics; J. K. McDermott, Agricultural Economics; V. W. Ruttan, Agricultural Economics; J. W. Wiley, Economics. Philip Olson, now of Clark University, contributed both to the project formulation and analysis.

Introduction

In almost every year since 1921 more than 2 million people have moved to or from farms in the United States. Movement away from farms has dominated with the exclusion of a few exceptional years (USDA, AMS, February 1960).

Migration out of agriculture varies widely over time and among states and regions (Hathaway, 1960). There is also substantial variation among counties within individual states (Bottum, Dunbar and Kohlmeyer, 1960). Between 1950 and 1958 southern Indiana lost almost 50,000 individuals through migration while northern Indiana gained more than 120,000 from migration.

This study complements a similar study recently completed in a high income community in northern Indiana (Olson, 1960). The conceptual model is also similar to that used in a study of internal migration streams among Indiana counties for the periods 1935-40 and 1940-50 (Beshers and Nishiura, 1961). An attempt was made to extend the theoretical framework for job mobility and migration analysis employed by Olson in the northern Indiana study and to test its adequacy under sharply different economic and social conditions in southern Indiana.

The Study Area

For this second study of job mobility and migration a community was sought which would be about the same size as Brookston and in which opportunities for economic betterment would be more limited and economic pressures to express such motives would be stronger. The town of Shoals, about 25 miles southwest of Bedford in south central Indiana (Figure 1), satisfies these criteria.

The two communities are of approximately the same size. In 1960 the population of Shoals was 1,022 compared with a Brookston population of 1,202. The total population of the Shoals community is slightly more than 4,000 compared with about 2,000 in the Brookston community.

Table 1. Selected data on farm sales and off-farm employment in Martin and White counties.[a]

Factor	Martin County		White County	
	1954	1959	1954	1959
Percent all farms grossing over $10,000	8	13	41	50
Percent farmers working off-farm 100 or more days	47	42	15	21
Percent of farms with other income exceeding value of products sold	51	54	13	18

[a] Preliminary data, U. S. Census of Agriculture, 1960.

Economic opportunities have been more limited in Shoals than in Brookston during the last decade. Employment opportunities in White County, where Brookston is located, have increased, and the level of employment opportunities in Martin County, where Shoals is located, has been static. This picture of limited employment opportunity in Shoals as compared with Brookston is reinforced when employment gains in nearby industrial centers are traced (Figure 2). Workers in Brookston are within commuting distance of Lafayette, a rapidly expanding employment center in Tippecanoe County. Commuting opportunities are considerably more limited for workers in Shoals since employment opportunities in Bedford, in nearby Lawrence County, have actually declined during the 1950's.

Economic pressures to express motives of economic betterment are stronger in the Shoals community than in the Brookston community. Farmers in Martin County earn less from their farming operations than farmers in White County and, as a result, attempt to supplement incomes with off-farm employment to a greater extent (Table 1). Weekly earnings of workers employed in manufacturing in Martin County and White County are not greatly different. However, the White County (Brookston) worker who commutes to Lafayette has opportunities for higher earnings than the Martin County (Shoals) worker who commutes to Bedford (Figure 3).

Methodology

Following selection of Shoals as a study community, the next step was to define its boundaries. After conferring with informed residents of the area, it was decided that the townships of Halbert, Center, Lost River and the southern part of Mitchelltree were included in the Shoals community.

A series of informal interviews with leading residents and businessmen was conducted in the area to inform the community of the intentions



Figure 1. Locations of the study areas and selected Indiana metropolitan centers.



a/ Minimum number of employees in firms included was changed from 8 to 4.

Figure 2. Employment in four Indiana counties, January data.

and purpose of the study and to learn as much as possible about the community.

Return mail postcards were mailed to as many households as possible in the community.[1] An article was placed in the local newspaper at the time of each of the first two mailings to explain the study and to encourage a response from every household. The aggregate response from a total of three mailings was slightly over 42 percent. A random sample was drawn from the list of names of persons not responding to the three postcard mailings. Efforts to locate these non-respondents showed that over 43 percent did not qualify for the study; these had left the community, were too old or had died.

From information on the returned cards, all qualifying respondents were categorized according to job mobility and migration. The following categories were used.

		Community	
		No Change	Change
Job	No Change		
	Change		

Interviewees were chosen on the basis of samples drawn from the mobility categories. Data were obtained from the personal interviews to allow comparisons of personal characteristics to be made within each category.

Only males who were heads of households and between 31 and 65 years of age were interviewed. Information obtained was limited to the period from January 1950 through December 1959 to reduce the influence of historical factors beyond the intent and scope of this investigation.

The questionnaire used was basically the same as the one developed by Olson for the high income community. A few changes were made and a section was added to measure the respondents' information regarding the job market. Questionnaires were administered to 106 persons in the summer of 1960.

In order to measure the effects of a job change on social status, it was necessary to rank all interviewees on the basis of their community standing. The method used was developed by Warner (1949). Fourteen informants were selected in the informal interviewing which was done as the work progressed. These informants, or judges, were asked to rank the people in the sample according to their standing in the community. In the informal interviewing, it was found that the social structure of the community consisted of three basic groups. The informants were asked to place each of the persons interviewed into one of these three social classes—high, medium and low. Enough judges were chosen to allow most persons to be ranked eight or more times and all persons to be ranked at least once.

[1] The mailing list was developed from the voters registration list, a town voting list, tax assessors list, list of landowners in the community and the Shoals telephone book.



Figure 3. Average weekly earnings of manufacturing employees. (Data for the first quarter of each year.)

A Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Relationships

An understanding of the labor adjustment process requires consideration of the impact of both sociological and economic phenomena. An individual who has become accustomed to a way of living is not apt to consider changing his pattern of life unless there is an incentive of some kind which propels or attracts him. Also, each person considers himself a member of a social group or

groups which, in turn, influence him in many ways. He might aspire to a higher standard of living as he becomes conscious of his neighbors' achievements. He may set new goals for himself which he strives to achieve. These goals may be concerned with level of incomes or community standing. Desire to increase one's level of income indicates the presence of motives for economic betterment. It is likely that nearly everyone possesses such motives, but they are stronger in some people than others.

Closely interrelated, but distinguishable as a separate motive, is the desire to be a recognized part of a community social group. The desire for social betterment is likely to vary widely among individuals in a community. This feeling can seldom be detected in others and, furthermore, may even be unknown to the individual himself. Nevertheless, it affects his actions and the social groups with which he associates. It also has a bearing on the kind of occupation with which he is satisfied. The individual may feel that he can advance himself socially by changing his occupation.

The success which a particular individual achieves in expressing his motives for economic and social mobility is associated with the opportunities and impediments which he experiences as well as with variations in the strength of his motives. In a community with limited economic opportunity, motives for economic betterment will be expressed much less effectively than in a community characterized by expanding economic opportunities. Similarly, motives for social betterment will be expressed less successfully in a community characterized by a rigid social structure than in a community in which the social structure is more open. Where economic and social opportunities are limited, strong motives for social and economic betterment are frequently expressed by migration.

The modified Olson mobility model suggests the relationships that are relevant to the mobility processes (Figure 4). The degree of mobility, occupational and spatial, is not associated directly with the socioeconomic characteristics of age, income, social status and education. The effect of these characteristics on an individual's mobility pattern depends on the way in which these personal factors interact with the advantages and limitations of job knowledge, job skills, capital investment and community attachment (Figure 4). Certain combinations of the socioeconomic characteristics and the advantages and limitations may interact to limit mobility. Also functioning within this framework are motives for economic



Figure 4. Diagram of relationships and direction of influences of mobility forces.

and social betterment. The relative strength of the positive factors that increase mobility and the strength of the factors that have a negative effect on mobility will determine the final action of the individual.

The model and the mobility framework allow an analysis of this complex of interactions among the motives, impediments, opportunities and socioeconomic factors. It is then possible to direct attention to one phase of the process and draw hypotheses from specific associations to make possible a more thorough understanding of the entire mobility phenomenon.

Occupational Mobility Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that the personal characteristics, advantages, limitations, motives and opportunities are related to occupational or job mobility as follows:

Personal Characteristics

Age is inversely associated with job mobility. A young person above high school age is more apt to migrate than an older person because of stronger motives for betterment and fewer impediments.

Level of income is inversely associated with job mobility. The economic betterment motive is likely to be strong among low income individuals. This motive may also be expressed at high income levels if a job change would result in a sizable increase in income.

Social status is inversely associated with job mobility. The low status individual may attempt to advance himself socially and economically by becoming job mobile. He may have little capital

investment but be impeded by limited job knowledge and few special job skills.

Education is negatively associated with job mobility. Specialization in a field having a high educational requirement acts as a barrier to changes in occupation.

Advantages or Limitations

Knowledge of available jobs is directly associated with job mobility. Individuals who are aware of other job opportunities will change jobs more frequently than those who have limited knowledge of available jobs.

The presence of special job skills is directly associated with job mobility. Persons with skills have more freedom of movement among occupations. Mobility in and out of occupations requiring special training may be low, however.

The presence of a high capital investment is inversely associated with job mobility. Mobility will be greater among individuals who have little or no ownership interest in their present business.

Motives and Opportunities

Motives and opportunities for social and economic betterment are revealed through changes in social or economic position. Individuals may improve their economic position by changing jobs, through dual employment, or by achieving higher levels of skill or work in their existing employment. To advance themselves socially, they may strive for positions that have a high prestige in the community.

Spatial Mobility Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that personal characteristics, advantages, limitations, motives and opportunities are related to migration as follows:

Personal Characteristics

Age is inversely associated with migration. As people grow older, they adjust more readily to their situations and are less apt to migrate than younger persons who have stronger motives for betterment.

Level of income is directly associated with migration. Individuals who have high incomes are more likely to be voluntarily mobile and to overcome their impediments to migration.

High social status is directly associated with migration. The high status person is apt to overcome his impediments and take advantage of job opportunities elsewhere. The low status person is more likely to remain in his community and seek advancement through job mobility.

Education is directly associated with migration. Educated persons are more apt to be aware of opportunities for social and economic betterment than those with less education. Professional people often migrate to new areas to advance themselves in their fields. It is this voluntary mobility that is consistent with long-run objectives of betterment.

Advantages or Limitations

Knowledge of available jobs beyond the community of present residence is directly associated with migration. Possession of such job information is likely to indicate both adequate general information and experience in changing jobs or communities.

The presence of a high capital investment in the present business or occupation is inversely associated with migration. Such investment is an impediment to migration and evidence of successful expression of motives and opportunities for economic betterment.

The degree of attachment to the community in the form of participation in organizations, nearness to close relatives, and favorable community attitudes is inversely associated with migration. Such factors tend to impede the expression of motives for economic and social betterment which might lead to migration.

Motives and Opportunities

Motives and opportunities for social and economic betterment are revealed through migration. By changing communities, an individual may achieve a higher level of income even in the same occupation. A higher social position may also be achieved because of the variation in social standards in the two communities.

Dual Mobility

Job mobility and migration (spatial mobility) can occur separately or together. A person changing his area of residence is likely to change his main source of income. He may not change his occupation, however, but simply relocate and continue the same type of work.[2] The individual who moves to a new community and also changes jobs experiences dual mobility. Dual mobility is not uncommon among migrants. Professional people, however, often migrate and remain in the same occupation. This is usually in fulfillment of a plan

[2] Job mobility and occupational mobility are used synonymously throughout this study. Job or occupational mobility as used in this study occurs only when an individual changes his occupation but not when he changes employers or location while remaining in the same occupation.

of advancement characteristic of voluntarily mobile individuals.

The hypotheses are summarized in Table 2.

Job Mobility in Shoals Community

Job mobility refers to the movement of labor among occupations. In this section, only intra-community labor mobility will be considered.

Personal Factors

Age of persons was examined as it related to job mobility in the community. Although the literature fairly well establishes the inverse relation between age and mobility, no significant difference was found between the mobile and non-mobile groups in the Shoals population with respect to age. Several reasons for this lack of relationship may be suggested.

It is possible that in a low income community less importance and prestige are attached to remaining in one job, and older workers accept new occupations more readily. In Shoals, many persons in the higher age groups earned their livelihood by performing odd jobs. These older persons were quick to move from one form of self-employment to another, such as from handyman to timberworker. Other old people were receiving relatively low incomes from unskilled jobs and had changed occupations for various reasons—some of these changes were involuntary. The persons in the youngest group were more steadily employed in full-time jobs.

When levels of education were compared there was no difference between the mobile and non-mobile groups. Slightly over two-thirds of those who had changed jobs in the 10-year period had not finished high school. About 13 percent of the population—mobile and non-mobile—had more than 12 years of school.

There was no significant relation between the occupational incomes of the mobile and of the non-mobile group. Other studies have indicated that persons with low incomes change jobs more frequently than those with high incomes in order to advance themselves economically and because of dissatisfaction with their present jobs. This was not the case in Shoals.

Three explanations are suggested for the absence of a significant relation between job mobility and income: (a) members of the job-mobile group lack strong motives for economic betterment and change occupations for other reasons; (b) if the motives for economic betterment are present, they are subdued by impediments to mobility, and (c) it is possible that the motives suggested are present, but economic advancement may be hindered by limited education and the low number of available jobs in the community. Apparently, until the fairly recent location of two large gypsum mills in the community, very few jobs were available. Even at the time of the study, the local employment problem was not completely relieved.

Social status was inversely related to job mobility. A higher percentage of non-mobile than mobile persons were classified as high status (Table 3).

Examination of personal characteristics in the two groups as a whole showed no differences in age, income and education. The non-mobile persons had slightly higher social status.

Table 2. Summary of hypothesized relations among job mobility and migration and selected personal characteristics, advantages or limitations and motives.[a]

Factor	Job mobility	Migration
Personal characteristics:		
Age	−	−
Income	−	−
Social status	−	−
Education	−	−
Advantages or limitations:		
Job knowledge	+	+
Special job skills	+	nh
Capital investment	−	−
Community attachments:		
Favorable attitudes	nh	−
Organization participation	nh	−
Kinship ties	nh	−
Personal motives:		
Economic betterment	+	+
Social betterment	+	+

[a] Abbreviations indicate: (+) positive relationship; (−) inverse relationship; (nh) no relationship hypothesized.

Table 3. Social status and mobility, Shoals sample.[a]

Social status	Non-mobile		Mobile	
	No.	%	No.	%
High	14	24	7	15
Medium	37	63	26	55
Low	8	13	14	30
Total	59	100	47	100

$X^2 = 4.592$ df = 2 $P < .20$

[a] The sampling percentage varies among mobility categories. This means that the effect of the independent variable (social status in this table) on the dependent variable (mobility in this table) is determined by comparing the social status *distribution* between the two mobility categories rather than comparing the *number* of individuals in each social status group between the two mobility categories. This same comment applies to other tables in this report.

Motives for Mobility

Economic Betterment

One of the motives hypothesized as prompting job mobility is economic betterment. An individual may try to satisfy his motives for betterment by changing jobs. Fulfillment of the desire for betterment was measured by actual economic advancement during the study period. Job-mobile persons did not realize any greater economic advancement than did the non-mobile.

A system for measuring presence of economic betterment motives consists of noting the simultaneous occurrence of supplementary income and job mobility (Olson, 1960). No relation was found between supplementary income and job mobility. People who changed jobs one or more times did not rely on additional sources of income (e.g., dual employment, wife working) any more frequently than did those who remained in the same occupation for 10 years.

Table 4. Supplemental income and income advancement accompanying job changes by non-migrant job changers, 1950-60, Shoals sample.

	Income advancement			
	Experienced with job change		Did not experience with job change	
Supplemental income present: 1950-60	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	9	43	1	8
No	12	57	12	92
Total	21	100	13	100
$X^2=4.769$		df=1		$P<.05$

Table 5. Occupational income and supplementary income, 1959, Shoals sample.

Occupational income	Supplementary income			
	Present		Not present	
	No.	%	No.	%
$6,000 and under	26	72	59	84
Over $6,000	10	28	11	16
Total	36	100	70	100
$X^2=3.503$		df=1		$P<.10$

Table 6. Education and supplementary income, 1959, Shoals sample.

	Supplementary income			
	Present		Not present	
Educational level	No.	%	No.	%
Under 12 years	15	42	48	69
12 years	10	28	12	17
Over 12 years	11	30	10	14
Total	36	100	70	100
$X^2=7.369$		df=2		$P<.05$

The non-migrant job changers who had supplemental incomes in the 10-year period experienced greater income advancement from 1950 through 1959 than those who relied on only one source of income (Table 4).

Some persons who had supplemental incomes did not rely wholly on the additional income source for economic betterment but also received higher incomes from their main occupation. This suggests that the person who accepts dual employment has stronger motives for economic betterment and hence may be more apt to improve his position in other ways. Although Olson found an inverse relation in Brookston between level of occupational income and supplementary sources of income, a direct relation was found in Shoals (Table 5). People in the high income class in Shoals (over $6,000) indicated that they, as a group, had more sources of supplementary income than did the low income group ($6,000 and under).

A direct relation was found between level of education and supplementary income (Table 6). Individuals with a high level of education had more sources of additional income than did those at lower education levels.

If the presence of supplementary income is a meaningful measure of motives for economic betterment, it must be concluded that the higher income groups had either stronger motives for betterment or greater opportunities to express such motives than the low income groups. Although this contrasts with Olson's work, it is not an unreasonable conclusion for Shoals, an area of limited economic growth in recent years.

Non-mobile individuals were asked what salary would induce them to change occupations in the Shoals community, assuming they did not change their residence. The difference between the income given and the income the individual was receiving at the time is called the income differential. Of those who required a differential of $2,000 or more, one-half were persons in the lowest income group (Table 7). On the other hand only 27 percent of persons indicating a required differential of less than $1,000 were in the low income group.

A high income differential required for a job change was positively associated with social status (Table 8). The people having a high social status accounted for a greater proportion of the high income differential group than did those with a low status ranking. High social status individuals were in the high and low income differential groups only.

Table 7. Occupational income of non-mobile persons and income differential necessary for an occupational change, Shoals sample.

Occupational income	Income differential					
	Under $1,000		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000 and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	7	27	6	67	8	50
$3,600-$6,000	14	54	3	33	2	12
Over $6,000	5	19	0	0	6	38
Total	26	100	9	100	16	100

$X^2 = 11.486$ df = 4 $P < .05$

Table 8. Social status of non-mobile persons and income differential necessary for an occupational change, Shoals sample.

Social status	Income differential					
	Under $1,000		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000 and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
High	4	15	0	0	6	38
Medium	19	73	7	78	8	50
Low	3	12	2	22	2	12
Total	26	100	9	100	16	100

$X^2 = 6.176$ df = 4 $P < .20$

The better educated persons accounted for a greater share of the high differential group than they did of the low differential group (Table 9). The opposite was true of the lowest education class. An implication is that the relatively poorly educated individual will change jobs for a smaller economic incentive than the one with more advanced formal education. This pattern is consistent with the voluntary mobility, or planned advancement, of the better educated individual.

The income differential necessary for a job change within the community is also associated with the occupations of non-mobile persons (Table 10). Three occupational classes, professional, manager-proprietor and farm operator, accounted for 88 percent of the $2,000 and over differential group. Semi-skilled and unskilled non-mobile individuals disclosed that they would change occupations for a much lower differential.

Social Betterment

The second motive presented in the model as prompting job mobility is social betterment, the desire of the individual to increase his standing in the community or raise his prestige in some way. Each interviewee was asked to rank occupations on the basis of the prestige he attached to each job. The person's occupation before and after the job change was compared with this ranking to determine the change in status perceived by those who changed jobs. If motives for social betterment were present, one would expect to find a significantly greater number of job changers who thought they had increased their status over the 10-year period than those who thought they had decreased or experienced no change in status. The results indicate that the number of persons who thought they had increased their status by changing jobs was not significantly greater than the number who felt their status had decreased or remained the same.

A relation was found between the judges' ranking of social status and self-evaluation of prestige change (Table 11). No one ranked as having high social status indicated that he felt a decreasing job prestige by changing jobs.

Table 9. Level of education of non-mobile persons and income differential necessary for an occupational change, Shoals sample.

Education	Income differential					
	Under $1,000		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000 and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 12 years	17	66	9	100	7	44
12 years	4	15	0	0	3	19
Over 12 years	5	19	0	0	6	37
Total	26	100	9	100	16	100

$X^2 = 8.291$ df = 4 $P < .10$

Table 10. Occupation of non-mobile persons and income differential necessary for an occupational change, Shoals sample.

Occupation	Income differential					
	Under $1,000		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000 and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional	3	12	0	0	4	25
Manager-proprietor	3	12	0	0	4	25
Farm operator	3	12	3	33	6	38
Clerical-sales	1	3	0	0	0	0
Skilled	3	12	3	33	0	0
Semi-skilled	9	34	1	11	1	6
Unskilled	3	12	0	0	1	6
Farm labor	1	3	2	23	0	0
Total	26	100	9	100	16	100

$X^2 = 25.972$ df = 14 $P < .05$

Table 11. Judges' social class rating of job-mobile and self-evaluation of prestige change, Shoals sample.

Prestige change	Judges rating					
	High		Medium		Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Increase	3	43	11	42	4	33
Decrease	0	0	10	39	2	17
Same	4	57	5	19	6	50
Total	7	100	26	100	12	100

$X^2 = 7.607$ df = 4 $P < .20$

Table 12. Occupational income and social status, Shoals sample.

	Social status					
	High		Medium		Low	
Income group	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	2	9	30	48	13	59
$3,500-$6,000	6	29	26	41	8	36
Over $6,000	13	62	7	11	1	5
Total	21	100	63	100	22	100

$X^2 = 31.655$ df = 4 $P < .001$

Table 13. Social status of occupational classes, present occupation, Shoals sample.

	Social status					
	High		Medium		Low	
Occupational group	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional	10	48	2	3	0	0
Manager-proprietor	7	33	7	11	0	0
Farmer	3	14	13	21	4	19
Clerical-sales	0	0	4	6	0	0
Skilled	1	5	10	16	2	9
Semi-skilled	0	0	15	24	8	36
Unskilled	0	0	9	14	8	36
Farm labor	0	0	3	5	0	0
Total	21	100	63	100	22	100

$X^2 = 63.091$ df = 14 $P < .001$

Table 14. Job knowledge of mobile and non-mobile, Shoals sample.

	Non-mobile		Mobile	
Job knowledge score	No.	%	No.	%
Low	46	81	15	33
High	11	19	31	67
Total	57	100	46	100

$X^2 = 24.371$ df = 1 $P < .001$

Table 15. Association of job knowledge and education, Shoals sample.

	Job knowledge			
	Low		High	
Education	No.	%	No.	%
Under 12 years	42	69	20	48
12 years	9	15	13	31
Over 12 years	10	16	9	21
Total	61	100	42	100

$X^2 = 5.258$ df = 2 $P < .10$

Table 16. Association of job knowledge and income, Shoals sample.

	Job knowledge			
	Low		High	
Income class	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	28	46	13	31
$3,600-$6,000	24	39	17	40
Over $6,000	9	15	12	29
Total	61	100	42	100

$X^2 = 3.739$ df = 2 $P < .20$

Level of income was directly associated with social status. Almost two-thirds of the individuals in the high social class had incomes of over $6,000, whereas 5 percent of the low social class were in the high income group (Table 12).

There is a relation between an individual's social status and his occupation (Table 13). Of those persons considered by the judges to be in a high social class, 81 percent were in the professional and the manager-proprietor classes. Similarly 72 percent of the low social class was comprised of semi-skilled and unskilled laborers.

It seems clear that in the Shoals community motives for social and economic betterment among the lower income and lower social status individuals were either of limited intensity or they were frustrated by lack of local economic opportunities or by the rigidity of the community's social structure. Higher income individuals, on the other hand, were apparently fairly successful in expressing their motives for both social and economic betterment.

Impediments to Mobility

Job knowledge is directly associated with job mobility (Table 14). Those who changed jobs indicated that they had greater knowledge of available job opportunities before the change than the non-mobile group had at the time of the study.

Of the job-mobile persons who changed jobs voluntarily, 42 percent said they had to spend some time in locating a job after they decided to quit their previous work. Fifty-eight percent said they knew of their present job before they decided to quit their previous occupation. Of this latter group, 80 percent indicated that this knowledge influenced their decision to change jobs.

Job knowledge was directly associated with education (Table 15). Sixty-nine percent of the sample persons with a low job knowledge score had not completed high school. Those with at least a high school education comprised over half of the group that displayed high job knowledge. High job knowledge was, in turn, positively associated with income (Table 16).

Also, as income increased, knowledge of available jobs increased.

Another impediment to mobility was lack of special job skills resulting from specialized training or education. The absence of special job skills may restrict the rate of mobility because of failure to qualify for work in a different occupation. The presence of job skills for the person who is in

an occupation requiring these skills could also restrict his mobility from that job.

No relation was found between special job skills and mobility. It is possible that job skills have restricted the mobility of the non-mobile persons and have also accounted for a portion of the mobility of the mobile persons. These two situations may have offset each other.

The presence of special job skills was directly associated with income (Table 17). Forty percent of those persons with special job skills had incomes over $6,000. Only 5 percent of the group that did not have special job skills were in the high income group.

Table 17. Level of occupational income and presence of special job skills, Shoals sample.

	Special job skills			
	Yes		No	
Income	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	13	29	32	52
$3,500-$6,000	14	31	26	43
Over $6,000	18	40	3	5
Total	45	100	61	100

$X^2 = 20.386$ $df = 2$ $P < .001$

Capital investment in the business restricted job mobility (Table 18). A measure of investment for this purpose is degree of ownership. A greater percentage of non-mobile than of mobile persons were owners. The mobile group consisted largely of persons who indicated no ownership in a business.

An alternative measure of capital invested as well as occupational security is the form in which individuals were paid. An inverse relationship existed between job mobility and self-employment (Table 19). It is likely that the self-employed individual had the greatest amount of capital invested in his business as compared with individuals receiving income from a salary, commission or hourly wage. Workers earning an hourly wage are likely to have a smaller investment in their occupations than persons in the other categories. These data are consistent with the hypothesis that the self-employed have more security in their occupations and change occupations less often than the salaried and hourly wage earners.

In the Shoals community the presence of both special job skills and capital investment in a business act to limit occupational mobility. On the other hand, knowledge of employment alternatives acts to increase the rate of mobility.

Job Mobility of Farm Workers

The previous section dealt with job mobility in the entire population of the Shoals community. This section deals specifically with agricultural labor.

There was no significant difference between mobile and non-mobile farmers with respect to age. Although Olson found a highly significant difference between the age of full-time farmers and former full-time farmers in Brookston, this study revealed no differences.

The social status of current farmers was not significantly different from that of former farmers. Hence, it is impossible to tell whether the high status or low status farmers moved out of farming. The current farmers were ranked at a time when they were farming, but the former farmers who were ranked were in other occupations. It is possible that the status of the former farmers changed since the time when they were farming.

There was also no significant difference between the social status of current farmers and former farmers when the full-time and part-time farmers were considered separately.

There was no significant relation between the mobile and non-mobile farm group when level of education was compared. Seventy-one percent of the farmers had less than a high school education.

Table 18. Capital investment and mobility, all jobs, Shoals sample.

	Non-mobile		Mobile[a]	
Ownership status	No.	%	No.	%
Owner	19	32	16	14
Part owner	8	14	5	4
No ownership	32	54	97	82
Total	59	100	118	100

$X^2 = 15.788$ $df = 2$ $P < .001$

[a] The mobile category refers to all jobs held by the job-mobile people in the study period. Hence, the total for the mobile group does not refer to actual numbers of persons but, instead, to the jobs occupied by the job changers.

Table 19. Type of income for mobile and non-mobile, all jobs, 1950-60, Shoals sample.

	Non-mobile		Mobile	
Type of income	No.	%	No.	%
Salary	14	24	36	30
Self-employed	25	42	22	19
Commission	0	0	5	4
Hourly wage	20	34	56	47
Total	59	100	119	100

$X^2 = 13.203$ $df = 3$ $P < .01$

Table 20. Management score and income of farmers, Shoals sample.

Income groups	Management score			
	Low		High	
	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	11	100	11	69
$3,600-$6,000	0	0	4	25
Over $6,000	0	0	1	6
Total	11	100	16	100

$X^2 = 4.240$ df = 2 $P < .20$

Table 21. Self-evaluation of prestige change of former full-time or part-time farmers, 1950-60, Shoals sample.

Prestige change	Observed		Expected	
	No.	%	No.	%
Increase	1	14	2.33	33.3
Decrease	5	72	2.33	33.3
Same	1	14	2.33	33.3
Total	7	100	6.99	99.9

$X^2 = 4.573$ df = 2 $P < .20$

Only 5 percent had gone beyond 12 years of formal education.

The difference in education between the full-time, part-time and former farmers was not significant.

Income from farming was directly related to the management ability of the operator (Table 20). Those persons who had the highest income from farming received the highest management scores.[3] There was no difference between the management scores of the full-time and part-time farmers.

Motives for Mobility

Economic Betterment

One reason for leaving farming may be to increase total income. All of the former farmers had had gross farm sales of less than $10,000 when they quit farming.

Income advancement of farmers over the 10-year period was compared with the presence of a supplementary source of income. Farmers with supplemental income at the time of the study had not advanced in total income more rapidly than the group that had only one source of income. The extreme fluctuation in farming incomes may, however, tend to hide the effects of additional income sources. Agriculture in the Shoals area is extremely susceptible to weather hazards. It has not been unusual in the past few years to have many crops seriously damaged or destroyed by heavy rains and flooding.

The data showed no differences between former farmers or current farmers with respect to sources of additional income. Again this relationship may be obscured since for former farmers, the additional income for the last year farmed was recorded and for current farmers, the additional income in 1959 was used.

Social Betterment

A second factor likely to influence a farmer's movement from agriculture is the attitude he has regarding the prestige of off-farm work. The job prestige ratings by the former farmers show that nearly 86 percent of the former full-time farmers felt that they had failed to raise their status by leaving farming; 72 percent felt that they had decreased their status (Table 21). That is, they ranked their present occupation lower than farming on the occupation prestige scale. Fourteen percent of the former farmers felt an increase in prestige. In contrast, 40 percent of all job-mobile persons felt an increase in job prestige by changing occupations (Table 11).

Interviewees' ranking of occupations indicated that farming was about medium in prestige when compared with most other occupations. Many placed the occupations of school teacher, small businessman and salesman above farmer. Occupations which were usually listed below farmer were truck driver, foreman and miner. The opinions of the community residents tend to substantiate the former farmers' self-evaluations of prestige change accompanying an off-farm move. The type of occupation that the farmer is likely to look for when he contemplates a job change was usually considered to have less prestige than farming. However, it was not uncommon to find farming ranked on an equal basis with some of these lower prestige jobs. It is very likely that a high share of the persons farming in the Shoals community would not be qualified to occupy the type of position that was commonly ranked above farming. Hence, the farmer is not likely to raise his prestige in the eyes of his community by changing jobs.

It seems likely that the failure of former farmers who remained in the Shoals community to achieve significant economic gains over current farmers, combined with the impression that they have declined in social status in the community, acts to reduce mobility out of agriculture in the Shoals community.

[3] In arriving at a management score, each farmer was asked questions relating to practices in his farm business. The possible answers for each question were weighted to give the highest total score for the most accurate answers.

Impediments to Mobility

Lack of job knowledge also restricted the rate of mobility from farming (Table 22). Eighty-six percent of the current farmers had low job knowledge scores. When job knowledge of farmers was compared with job knowledge of non-farmers, no significant difference was found. This suggests that the farm operator group is as well informed of available job opportunities as is the non-farm group.

Lack of special job skills did not exert a differential impact on movement out of farming. The difference in job skills between the persons who left farming and those currently farming was not significant.

The third impediment in the model is capital investment. Land ownership by the current farmers and the former farmers was compared to measure the difference in capital investment. Although a significant difference was found in Brookston, no difference was present in Shoals. Possibly the former farmers in Shoals remained landowners and merely changed occupations. If the major farm investment is land, the farm operator's problem of liquidating his assets will not be likely to restrict his movement from farming because he can rent the land. Of seven former farmers in the sample, three had rented and four had owned their farms. Three of them still owned their land at the time of the study but were engaged in another occupation. Two of these three landowners had placed their land in the acreage reserve, and the third used farming as a supplemental source of income.

Also, in contrast to Olson's work, no difference was found between current and former farmers' total acreage. Typically, only a small portion of the total acreage is tillable in the Shoals area because much of the land is in timber. Although a more useful measure of farm size is probably the number of tillable acres, there was no significant difference between the current and former farmers on this basis, either.

Migration into Shoals Community

An analysis was also made of the experience of migrants into the Shoals community between 1950 and 1960 who had remained in the community. Data were collected concerning personal characteristics and their relation to the hypothesized motives and impediments.

Three age groups were used in categorizing (Table 23). Approximately one-third of the non-migrant population fell into each category. Of

Table 22. Job knowledge of current and former farmers, Shoals sample.

	Current farmers		Former farmers	
Job knowledge	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Low	12	86	3	50
High	2	14	3	50
Total	14	100	6	100

$X^2=2.857$ df = 1 $P<.10$

Table 23. Age of migrants and non-migrants, Shoals population.

	Non-migrant		Migrant	
Age	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
31-42	99	36	35	69
43-54	101	37	9	17
55-65	75	27	7	14
Total	275	100	51	100

$X^2=18.929$ df = 2 $P<.01$

Table 24. Education of migrants and non-migrants, Shoals population.

	Non-migrant		Migrant	
Education	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
Under 12 years	177	64	29	57
12 years	73	27	6	12
Over 12 years	26	9	16	31
Total	276	100	51	100

$X^2=19.006$ df = 2 $P<.10$

Table 25. Occupational income of migrants and non-migrants, 1959, Shoals sample.

	Non-migrant		Migrant	
Occupational income	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
$3,500 and under	32	43	13	41
$3,600-$6,000	32	43	8	25
Over $6,000	10	14	11	34
Total	74	100	32	100

$X^2=6.915$ df = 2 $P<.10$

people who had moved into the community in the 10-year period, a much greater number were in the youngest age group. Only 36 percent of the non-migrants fell into the youngest group, but 69 percent of the people who moved into the area were in this age category.

A highly significant difference in education was found. Nearly two-thirds of the non-migrant Shoals population had less than 12 years of schooling (Table 24). It is likely that the people who have more formal education are following patterns of mobility consistent with long-run objectives of job advancement.

The level of occupational income of the migrant group is consistent with their higher education (Table 25). Whereas over one-third of the people

Table 26. Social status of migrants and non-migrants, Shoals sample.

Social status	Non-migrant		Migrant	
	No.	%	No.	%
High	11	15	10	31
Medium	45	61	18	56
Low	18	24	4	13
Total	74	100	32	100

$X^2 = 4.614$ df = 2 $P < .20$

Table 27. Income differential necessary for community change of non-mobile migrants and non-migrants, Shoals sample.

Income differential	Non-migrant		Migrant	
	No.	%	No.	%
Under $1,000	7	19	7	50
$1,000-$1,999	10	27	3	21
$2,000 and over	20	54	4	29
Total	37	100	14	100

$X^2 = 5.102$ df = 2 $P < .10$

Table 28. Level of occupational income of non-mobile persons and income differential necessary for a community change, Shoals sample.

Income	Income Differential: Under $1,000		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000 and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	2	14	6	46	13	54
$3,600-$6,000	7	50	6	46	6	25
Over $6,000	5	36	1	8	5	21
Total	14	100	13	100	24	100

$X^2 = 7.838$ df = 4 $P < .10$

Table 29. Organization participation and occupational income, Shoals sample.

Income	Participation score: Low		High	
	No.	%	No.	%
$3,500 and under	25	60	20	31
$3,600-$6,000	17	40	23	36
Over $6,000	0	0	21	33
Total	42	100	64	100

$X^2 = 18.696$ df = 2 $P < .01$

in the migrant category had incomes over $6,000, only 14 percent of the long-time residents were in the high income group. The data suggest that the migrant population consists of relatively low and relatively high income persons. It may be that the persons with the high incomes were voluntarily mobile and those in the low income group were involuntarily mobile, i.e., they moved to the community for reasons other than planned occupational advancement. It is logical to surmise that persons in the low income group migrated to seek economic betterment and their geographic mobility was only incidental to their job mobility.

The proportion of low social status persons was higher in the non-migrant group than in the migrant category (Table 26).

Change in social status resulting from migration was not indicated in this analysis. Each migrant was ranked in his present location only. The high percentage of migrants who received a high rating was due, in part, to the number of professional people who had moved into the community in the period studied.

Individuals who had not changed jobs during the study period were asked what salary they would have to receive in another position before they would leave the Shoals community. The difference between the salary given and the salary the individual was receiving at the time is called the "income differential." Those who had migrated into Shoals were more willing than long term residents to leave Shoals for a relatively small income differential (Table 27).

The income differential necessary for a community change was also related to occupational income (Table 28). Those who had low incomes made up a greater share of the high differential ($2,000 and over) group than did those who had high incomes. Likewise, the high income group made up a greater share of the low differential group (under $1,000) than of the high differential group.

The migration model identifies several impediments to geographic mobility. It was hypothesized that the person who takes an active part in his community is less likely to migrate than one who is not interested in community undertakings and community life.[4] There was no difference in community participation between the migrant and the non-migrant groups. It seems reasonable that newcomers to the community would be less active in community organizations than people who had lived in the community for a longer time. Hence, the migrants would be expected to have a lower participation score than the non-migrants. Because they had similar scores, it appears that migrants tend to participate in community life more than non-migrants.

A direct relation was found between organization participation and level of income (Table 29). Sixty percent of those persons who had a low par-

[4] A method developed for measuring such participation (Hay, 1948) was used by Olson and was also used in this study. With this method, an individual receives points for participation in any organization. The scoring is as follows: one point for membership, two for occasional attendance, three for regular attendance, four for committee member and five for officer. Only the highest point value for any one organization was used in arriving at the individual's total score. A score of 10 or below was considered low participation and a score above 10 was considered high.

ticipation score were in the low income group. There was no one in the high income group who scored low on organization participation.

Organization participation was also directly related to social status (Table 30). Thirty percent of the persons who had a high participation score were ranked as having a high social status. Only 5 percent of the low scorers had high social status.

Migration was associated with occupation (Table 31). The greatest differences between the migrants and non-migrants were in the professional, farm operator, skilled and semi-skilled occupations. Twenty-one percent of the migrants were in the professional category compared with only 3 percent of the non-migrants. Farm operators (full and part-time) made up a much smaller proportion of the migrant group than they did of the non-migrant group. This is consistent with the hypothesis that high capital investment tends to restrict migration. Skilled workers made up a greater percent of the migrant group than of the non-migrant group. However, the semi-skilled group represented a larger proportion of the non-migrant group than of the migrant group. Within the skilled labor classification are such occupations as carpenter and electrician. These are somewhat similar to professional positions in that the worker does not usually have a high capital investment and is paid for his abilities to perform a service. Hence, he is not restricted to one job in one location.

The third impediment to migration hypothesized in the model was lack of knowledge of jobs available in other areas. Past work has shown (Smith, 1956) that most people learn of job opportunities through conversation or correspondence with friends and relatives. The added job information reduces the risk of moving and was found to be a major factor in affecting mobility. In this study no relation was found between migration and high job knowledge. Lack of knowledge will not constitute an impediment to migration if the person obtains the necessary job information after he makes the decision to leave the community. Although he may not be cognizant of opportunities in other areas, he may decide to move for other reasons.

Job knowledge was associated with level of education (Table 15). A relatively high percentage of persons with low job knowledge had less than 12 years education. A higher percentage of the high job knowledge group than of the low consisted of those persons with more than 12 years of education.

Table 30. Organization participation and social status, Shoals sample.

	Participation score			
	Low		High	
Social status	No.	%	No.	%
High	2	5	19	30
Medium	27	63	36	57
Low	14	32	8	13
Total	43	100	63	100

$X^2 = 13.374$ df = 2 $P < .01$

Table 31. Job classification of migrants and non-migrants, Shoals population.

	Non-migrants		Migrants	
Occupation	No.	%	No.	%
Professional	8	3	11	21
Manager-proprietor	33	12	6	12
Farm operator	67	25	6	12
Clerical-sales	16	6	3	6
Skilled	10	4	8	15
Semi-skilled	52	19	5	10
Unskilled	72	26	11	21
Farm labor	3	1	0	0
Unemployed	6	2	0	0
Retired	7	2	2	3
Total	274	100	52	100

$X^2 = 44.543$ df = 9 $P < .001$

Migration from one area to another was looked on as a necessity in many cases by most of the Shoals residents. When asked their impression of people who moved from the Shoals community, 94 percent of the long-time residents (non-migrants) indicated a favorable impression. They thought such moves were justified in order to find a job or better oneself because of the low wage scale and limited opportunities in Shoals. Of the migrants questioned, 96 percent felt the moves were justified for those who had left Shoals. This attitude of the Shoals residents toward migration supports the use of the conceptual framework in analyzing the migration process. If there is nothing discreditable associated with migration, i.e., if attitudes toward migration do not act as an impediment, the motives and impediments presented in the model are more likely to be freely expressed.

The analysis presented in this section emphasizes that migration into low income rural communities can complement migration out of the same communities. Without immigration Shoals would be deprived of most of the professional and technical occupations that contribute to a community's standard of living regardless of the community income level.

Table 32. Association of age and migration and job mobility, Shoals population.

		Job mobility classification			
		Non-mobile		Mobile	
Age group		No.	%	No.	%
	31-42	63	36	36	36
Non-migrant	43-54	63	36	38	38
	55-65	49	28	26	26
Total		175	100	100	100
	31-42	14	74	21	66
Migrant	43-54	3	16	6	19
	55-65	2	10	5	15
Total		19	100	32	100

$X^2=33.215$ df=2 $P<.001$

Table 33. Association of income and migration and job mobility, Shoals sample.

		Job mobility classification			
		Non-mobile		Mobile	
Income group		No.	%	No.	%
	$3,500 and under	17	43	15	44
Non-migrant	$3,600-$6,000	16	40	16	47
	Over $6,000	7	17	3	9
	Total	40	100	34	100
	$3,500 and under	8	42	5	38
Migrant	$3,600-$6,000	5	26	3	24
	Over $6,000	6	32	5	38
	Total	19	100	13	100

$X^2=8.327$ df=2 $P<.05$

Table 34. Association of social status and migration and job mobility, Shoals sample.

	Social status	Non-mobile		Mobile	
		No.	%	No.	%
	High	7	18	4	12
	Medium	26	65	19	56
Non-migrants	Low	7	17	11	32
	Total	40	100	34	100
	High	7	37	3	23
Migrants	Medium	11	58	7	54
	Low	1	5	3	23
	Total	19	100	13	100

$X^2=9.746$ df=2 $P<.01$

Table 35. Association of education and migration and job mobility, Shoals population.

		Job mobility classification			
	Education group	Non-mobile		Mobile	
		No.	%	No.	%
	Under 12 years	106	60	71	71
	12 years	51	29	22	22
Non-migrant	Over 12 years	19	11	7	7
	Total	176	100	100	100
	Under 12 years	11	58	18	56
Migrant	12 years	1	5	5	16
	Over 12 years	7	37	9	28
	Total	19	100	32	100

$X^2=36.727$ df=2 $P<.001$

Dual Mobility

An individual may move from one community to another without changing his occupation; he may change his occupation and remain in the same community; or he may move to a new community and also change his occupation. The combination of occupational and community mobility is called dual mobility. Dual mobility in the Shoals community is analyzed in this section.[5]

There was an inverse relation between age and migration (Table 32). The data show that the youngest age group accounted for a greater proportion of the migrants than of the non-migrants. Considering only the non-mobile group, 74 percent of the migrants were 31-42 whereas only 36 percent of the non-migrants were in this age category. Conversely, there was a higher proportion of non-migrants than migrants in the older age group (55-65).

The person who changes communities but remains in the same occupation tends to be younger than the person who changes community but also changes occupation. This implies that the mobility in the first group is largely voluntary whereas the mobility in the second group is primarily involuntary.

A comparison of migration and job mobility with income showed that migrants had a greater percentage of high income people than did the non-migrants (Table 33). Thirty-four percent of the migrants had incomes over $6,000 compared with 14 percent of the non-migrants. Of the non-migrants who changed jobs, only 9 percent had occupational incomes exceeding $6,000; 38 percent of the migrant job changers had incomes over $6,000.

A significant relation was found between social status and mobility and migration (Table 34). High status persons constituted a higher proportion of the migrant category than of the non-migrant category. The individuals with high status also constituted a larger proportion of the non-mobile group than of the job-mobile group.

Consistent with the high social status and voluntary mobility of the migrant group is the relatively high percentage of migrants with college training (Table 35). Thirty-one percent of the migrants had had over 12 years of formal educa-

[5] The multiple contingency table (Sutcliff, 1957) is used to present the data to allow a comparison of spatial and occupational mobility with regard to the personal characteristics of age, income, education and social status. The absence of a significant relationship indicates mutual independence of the three variables, namely, spatial mobility, occupational mobility, and the personal characteristic in the respective table. A significant relationship indicates that the variables are interrelated.

tion compared with only 9 percent of the non-migrants. There was a greater concentration of migrants at the low and high education levels and less at the medium level. This was especially true of the non-job-mobile migrants.

Migration and job mobility were associated with certain occupations (Table 36). It has been suggested that the professional person changes his area of residence (but not his occupation) in partial fulfillment of a long-range plan of economic betterment; that is, he is voluntarily mobile. The data support this conjecture. Professional persons accounted for 43 percent of the non-mobile migrants, and only 15 percent of the mobile migrants. Skilled laborers were also characterized by a relatively great amount of migration without a change in occupation. The skilled worker has special training that is likely to restrict his movement from his occupation.

Table 36. Association of occupational type, migration and job mobility, Shoals sample.

	Occupational type	Job mobility classification: Non-mobile No.	Non-mobile %	Mobile No.	Mobile %
Non-migrants	Professional	2	5	1	3
	Manager-proprietor	6	15	5	15
	Farmer	11	28	4	12
	Clerical-sales	1	2	1	3
	Skilled	4	10	4	12
	Semi-skilled	9	22	11	32
	Unskilled	4	10	8	23
	Farm-labor	3	8	0	0
	Total	40	100	34	100
Migrants	Professional	8	43	2	15
	Manager-proprietor	2	10	1	8
	Farmer	3	16	2	15
	Clerical-sales	1	5	0	0
	Skilled	3	16	2	15
	Semi-skilled	2	10	1	8
	Unskilled	0	0	5	39
	Farm labor	0	0	0	0
	Total	19	100	13	100

$X^2 = 41.789$ df = 7 $P < .001$

The manager-proprietor occupational class constituted a slightly larger share of the non-migrants than of the migrants. Persons in these occupations may be self-employed businessmen or they may have a position with responsibilities of such a nature that they have exceptional security in their jobs. This tends to reduce migration. It is possible that capital investment reduces migration of individuals among proprietors. This may also apply to farming. Farmers accounted for the greatest percentage of persons in the non-job-mobile, non-migrant category.

The semi-skilled group made up the greatest proportion of the non-migrant job-mobile category. Individuals in this group were more often non-migrants than migrants. It is possible that semi-skilled workers migrate less because it is relatively easy for them to change occupation within the community.

The data show that unskilled persons had a tendency to remain in one community and change jobs frequently within the community. There were no persons in this class who changed communities but did not change their occupations. Apparently, like the semi-skilled worker, the unskilled worker attempts to better himself by a job change within the community in preference to a change to a new community.

Comparison of Shoals and Brookston

One purpose of using the same analytical framework to study both the Shoals and Brookston communities was to permit comparisons. Definite differences as well as similarities were observed in the impact of motives, impediments, opportunities and socio-economic factors on job mobility and migration in the two communities.

Comparison of Migrants

Personal characteristics of the migrants were compared with those of the non-migrants in both communities. Migrants were younger and better educated than the non-migrants. However, a greater proportion of the Shoals migrants received incomes over $6,000 than was characteristic of the Brookston migrants (Table 37). Also, a high percentage of Shoals migrants had incomes of $3,500 and under, whereas over half of the migrants in Brookston were in the middle-income category.

Comparison of social status showed a difference between the migrant groups of the two communities (Table 38). In Brookston, the migrant was likely to have an average social status and less likely to have a high social status than the

Table 37. Occupational income of migrants and non-migrants in a low and a high income rural community.

	Income	Non-migrants No.	Non-migrants %	Migrants No.	Migrants %
Shoals	$3,500 and under	32	43	13	41
	$3,600—6,000	32	43	8	25
	Over $6,000	10	14	11	34
	Total	74	100	32	100
Brookston	$3,500 and under	25	45	15	26
	$3,600-6,000	20	36	31	54
	Over $6,000	11	19	11	20
	Total	56	100	57	100

$X^2 = 22.127$ df = 2 $P < .001$

non-migrant. In Shoals, the migrant was more apt to have a high social status and less likely to have a lower status than the non-migrant.

The relatively high percentage of migrants in Shoals who had high status compared with the low number of Brookston migrants who had high status suggests a difference in the social and economic structure of the two communities.

Professional persons constituted a relatively high proportion of the migrants in Shoals. There these persons were also ranked as having high social status in this low income area. Apparently, professional people are considered to have only medium status in Brookston; in order to achieve high status longer residence is apparently required than in Shoals. It can be inferred from this that a person in a professional (or a similar) occupational class can frequently raise his social prestige by migrating from a high income community to one characterized by relatively low incomes.

Table 38. Social status of migrants and non-migrants in a low and a high income rural community.

	Social status	Non-migrants No.	Non-migrants %	Migrants No.	Migrants %
Shoals	High	11	15	10	31
	Medium	45	61	18	56
	Low	18	24	4	13
	Total	74	100	32	100
Brookston	High	13	24	8	12
	Medium	31	57	45	73
	Low	10	19	9	15
	Total	54	100	62	100

$X^2=21.385$ df=2 $P<.001$

Table 39. Age of mobile and non-mobile persons in a low and a high income rural community.

	Age	Non-mobile No.	Non-mobile %	Mobile No.	Mobile %
Shoals	31-42	77	49	57	43
	43-54	66	34	44	33
	55-65	51	26	31	24
	Total	194	100	132	100
Brookston	31-42	71	35	68	63
	43-54	73	36	31	28
	55-65	60	29	10	9
	Total	204	100	109	100

$X^2=28.314$ df=2 $P<.001$

Table 40. Occupational income of mobile and non-mobile persons in a low and in a high income rural community.

	Income	Non-mobile No.	Non-mobile %	Mobile No.	Mobile %
Shoals	$3,500 and under	25	42	20	43
	$3,600-6,000	21	36	19	40
	Over $6,000	13	22	8	17
	Total	59	100	47	100
Brookston	$3,500 and under	15	27	20	42
	$3,600-6,000	25	45	22	47
	Over $6,000	16	28	5	11
	Total	56	100	47	100

$X^2=8.054$ df=2 $P<.05$

In considering impediments to migration, there was very little evidence to support the hypothesized relationship of non-migration and community attachments. In both communities, neither organization participation nor community attitudes was related to migration.

In Brookston, there was little connection between community attachments and age, income or social status. In both Brookston and in Shoals, a high level of education was found to characterize the individuals who scored high in community participation. In general, persons with relatively little formal education were not active in community life. High income and high social status were also associated with organization participation in Shoals. The fact that these relations were not found to exist in Brookston reinforces the conclusion that social status does not depend as directly on income level as in Shoals.

Comparison of Job Mobility

Age and job mobility were not significantly related in the low income area. However, an inverse relation was found between age and job mobility in Brookston (Table 39). The youngest age group in the sample accounted for 43 percent of the mobile group in Shoals and for 63 percent of the mobile persons in Brookston. Individuals in the oldest age group accounted for 24 percent of the mobile persons in Shoals and for only 9 percent in Brookston.

A possible explanation of this difference is that in a high income area people are able to advance further occupationally and hence are able to satisfy their motives for economic betterment without becoming mobile. In Shoals, however, persons in the older age group experience both considerable involuntary job mobility and considerable exploratory job mobility initiated by a need for a greater income.

Although level of occupational income was not related to job mobility in Shoals, a significant relation existed in Brookston (Table 40). The lowest income group accounted for 42 percent of the non-mobile persons in Shoals and for 27 percent of this group in Brookston. The high income persons made up 17 percent of the mobile category in Shoals and 11 percent of the mobile category in Brookston. This, again, may be a reflection of

stronger motives for betterment among low income persons in Brookston compared with Shoals.

In both Shoals and Brookston, low social status was more prevalent among the job-mobile than among the non-mobile individuals. Likewise, the non-mobile person was more apt to have high status than low status.

Motives for Mobility

To measure the presence of motives for economic betterment among mobile persons, the amount of supplementary income of mobile and non-mobile persons was contrasted. Olson found that job-mobile individuals in Brookston had more sources of income, as a whole, than did the non-mobile (Table 41). No relation existed between supplementary income and mobility in the Shoals area. The extent to which the presence of supplementary income measures the motive or opportunities for economic betterment is not entirely clear. The limited economic growth of the Shoals community implies that even if people in both communities were characterized by the same intensity in motives for economic improvement, the motives would be expressed less successfully in Shoals than in Brookston.

No relationship was found in either study between the presence of additional income and the personal factors of age and social status.

Education was related to supplementary income in Shoals but not in Brookston. In Shoals persons with relatively high incomes made up a greater share of the group having supplemental income than they did of the group having no outside income source (Table 42). This relationship is in direct contrast to the data obtained in Brookston; individuals with high incomes had relatively little supplementary income. Ninety-three percent of the people in Brookston with supplementary incomes had incomes of $6,000 or under.

It is possible that strong motives for betterment do exist at low income levels in Shoals but are not expressed by the undertaking of a second job or a change in occupation. This appears to be a result of the shortage of secondary employment opportunities, particularly for women, in the Shoals community.

In measuring motives for social betterment the system of ranking occupations was used to evaluate indirectly the individual's perceived change in status. In Shoals, the difference was not significant between the actual number of persons who felt they had increased their status by a job change and the number of status increases that would be expected by chance alone. The inference is that the motive for social betterment is not useful in explaining differences in job mobility among individuals in Shoals. In Brookston, a larger proportion believed they had increased their prestige by changing jobs than would have occurred if there were no relation between social betterment and job mobility. This again reflects

Table 41. Supplementary income of mobile and non-mobile persons in a low and a high income rural community.

	Other income	Non-mobile		Mobile	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	Yes	20	34	16	34
	No	39	66	31	66
	Total	59	100	47	100
Brookston	Yes	9	15	18	31
	No	51	85	40	69
	Total	60	100	58	100

$X^2 = 7.458$ df = 1 $P < .01$

Table 42. Relationship of occupational income and supplementary income in a low and a high income rural community.

	Occupational income	Supplementary income			
		Yes		No	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	$6,000 and under	26	72	59	84
	Over $6,000	10	28	11	16
	Total	36	100	70	100
Brookston	$6,000 and under	26	93	56	75
	Over $6,000	2	7	19	25
	Total	28	100	75	100

$X^2 = 7.334$ df = 1 $P < .01$

Table 43. Social status of occupational classes in a low and a high income rural community.

	Occupation class	High		Medium		Low	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	Professional	10	48	2	3	0	0
	Manager-proprietor	7	33	7	11	0	0
	Farmer	3	14	13	21	4	19
	Clerical-sales	0	0	4	6	0	0
	Skilled	1	5	10	16	2	9
	Semi-skilled	0	5	15	24	8	36
	Unskilled	0	0	12	19	8	36
	Total	21	100	63	100	22	100
Brookston	Professional	2	10	0	0	0	0
	Manager-proprietor	8	38	10	12	0	0
	Farmer	9	42	25	33	0	0
	Clerical-sales	2	10	10	13	1	5
	Skilled	0	0	7	9	5	26
	Semi-skilled	0	0	13	17	5	26
	Unskilled	0	0	11	15	8	43
	Total	21	100	76	100	19	100

$X^2 = 147.508$ df = 12 $P < .001$

the greater economic opportunities available to Brookston residents.

There were differences between the two communities in the social status of individuals within the various occupational categories (Table 43). There were 21 persons in each sample who were ranked as having a high social status. Of course, the standard for high status in Brookston may be different from the standard for high status in Shoals. The professional class accounted for 48 percent of the high status persons in Shoals and for only 10 percent in Brookston. In Brookston farmers accounted for 42 percent of the high status group: there were no farmers ranked as having a low social status in this high income community. In Shoals farmers accounted for only 14 percent of the high status group and made up 19 percent of the low status category. The relatively high social status achieved by leading farm families in the Brookston community in contrast to the Shoals community reflects the difference in the levels of agricultural development in the two areas (Table 1).

Impediments to Mobility

In Brookston lack of job skills and capital investment acted to impede job mobility. In Shoals no relation was found between job skills and mobility. In general, persons with job skills had higher incomes, higher social status and higher levels of education than those who did not possess special skills. The individuals most likely to have these characteristics were in the professional occupational class. Olson found that there were relatively few exits from the professional and skilled occupational classes in Brookston. This substantiates the hypothesis that the presence of job skills may serve to inhibit movement from those jobs requiring skills. Furthermore, the high amount of mobility found in the Brookston study *within* the occupational classes of sales, semi-skilled, unskilled and farm labor indicates that a lack of job skills may impede mobility into other types of occupations. These occupational classes require few special job skills of their members.

Capital investment was an impediment to job mobility in Shoals (Table 19). People classified as owners and part-owners made up a relatively high proportion of the non-mobile group. This is in agreement with Olson's findings in Brookston.

Another measure of capital invested is the form of payment to, or type of income received by, persons in the mobility categories. In both communities, self-employed persons accounted for the largest share of the non-mobile group (Table 44). Individuals in this employment class are apt to have the greatest amount of capital investment. The self-employed made up a larger share of both the non-mobile and mobile categories in Brookston than they did in Shoals. Hourly wage earners accounted for a much larger share of both mobility categories in Shoals than they did in Brookston. This, perhaps, can be compared with the finding that more of the job changers in Brookston felt they had increased their status than they did in Shoals. This is consistent with the suggestion that a larger share of the job changes in Shoals represent involuntary job mobility. In Brookston, on the other hand, there appears to be more opportunity to move up from one occupational class to another. The result is a greater proportion of individuals in the self-employed class and very few non-mobile hourly wage earners.

Table 44. Type of income for mobile and non-mobile persons, all jobs in a low and a high income rural community.

		Non-mobile		Mobile	
Type of income		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	Salary	14	24	36	30
	Self-employed	25	42	22	19
	Commission	0	0	5	4
	Hourly wage	20	34	56	47
	Total	59	100	119	100
Brookston	Salary	14	23	46	42
	Self-employed	38	63	28	25
	Commission	3	5	4	4
	Hourly wage	5	9	32	29
	Total	60	100	110	100

$X^2 = 57.159$ $df = 3$ $P < .001$

Agricultural Labor Mobility

In the Shoals study, data concerning agricultural labor mobility were obtained only from persons remaining in the community. In the Brookston study, a small number who had quit farming and had left the community were also included. Comparison of the data from both studies indicates some relevant differences between the two communities in the characteristics of the agricultural population.

There was no significant age difference between the current and former farmers in Shoals (Table 45). In Brookston, however, a definite relation was found between age and farming status.

The current farmers in Brookston included more high status persons than did the current farming group in Shoals (Table 46). In addi-

tion, there were no current farmers with a low social status in Brookston, whereas 22 percent of the current farmers in Shoals had low social status. None of the former farmers interviewed in Shoals were ranked as having high status. Seven percent of Brookston former farmers had high social status.

The primary consideration in determining the presence of motives for economic betterment was the amount of additional income present. Although this measure may show the desire for improvement in economic status, it may also indicate an attempt to maintain total income in the face of declining occupational income. Olson found this to be the case in Brookston (Table 47). Whereas none of the current farmers in Brookston had supplementary employment income, 34 percent of the former farmers had supplementary employment income in the last year they farmed. Apparently, in attempting to raise or maintain total family income, the family tried supplementing farm income with outside sources and eventually changed to another occupation. Data from Shoals show no relation between additional income and farming status.

In Shoals the former farmers either had no greater motives for economic betterment than did the current farmers, or opportunities for economic betterment limited successful achievement of economic goals. In Shoals, therefore, the change from farming to another occupation apparently reflected the pressure of low agricultural income rather than opportunities for economic advancement to a greater extent than in Brookston.

In both communities, the findings show that a relatively small percentage of former farmers felt they had increased their job prestige by leaving farming compared with the job-mobile group as a whole. If an off-farm move means a decrease in status, fewer people will be willing to make the change unless they receive other benefits in the form of higher income or better working conditions in the new occupation.

The impediment which apparently inhibits movement out of farming most is high capital investment in the business. Capital investment is reflected in gross farm sales and in the ownership status of the farm operator. Farm acreage of the current and former farm operators was not used as a basis of comparison between the communities because of the great variation in land quality.

There was a difference between areas on the basis of gross farm sales (Table 48). Whereas 85 percent of the farmers in Shoals had gross sales

Table 45. Age of current farmers and former farmers in a low and a high income rural community.

	Age	Former farmers		Current farmers	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	31-42	3	50	6	30
	43-54	2	33	4	20
	55-65	1	17	10	50
	Total	6	100	20	100
Brookston	31-42	17	53	6	35
	43-54	13	41	2	12
	55-65	2	6	9	53
	Total	32	100	17	100

$X^2 = 33.207$ df = 2 $P < .001$

Table 46. Social status of current and former farmers in a low and a high income rural community.

	Social status	Current farmers		Former farmers	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	High	3	11	0	0
	Medium	18	67	5	71
	Low	6	22	2	29
	Total	27	100	7	100
Brookston	High	8	24	2	7
	Medium	25	76	23	77
	Low	0	0	5	16
	Total	33	100	30	100

$X^2 = 18.193$ df = 2 $P < .001$

Table 47. Supplementary income of current and former farm operators in a low and a high income rural community.

	Supplementary income	Current farmers		Former farmers (last yr. farmed)	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	Yes	4	20	1	17
	No	16	80	5	83
	Total	20	100	6	100
Brookston	Yes	0	0	10	34
	No	17	100	19	66
	Total	17	100	29	100

$X^2 = 17.127$ df = 1 $P < .001$

Table 48. Gross farm sales of current and former farm operators in a low and a high income rural community.

	Gross sales	Current farmers		Former farmers (last yr. farmed)	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals (1959)	$10,000 and under	23	85	6	100
	Over $10,000	4	15	0	0
	Total	27	100	6	100
Brookston (1957)	$10,000 and under	9	35	10	71
	Over $10,000	17	65	4	29
	Total	26	100	14	100

$X^2 = 20.025$ df = 1 $P < .001$

Table 49. Land ownership of current and former farm operators in a low and a high income rural community.

	Ownership status	Current farmers		Former farmers	
		No.	%	No.	%
Shoals	Full owners	15	56	3	50
	Tenants	12	44	3	50
	Total	27	100	6	100
Brookston	Full owners	10	59	10	31
	Tenants	7	41	22	69
	Total	17	100	32	100

$X^2=23.848$ df=1 $P<.001$

of $10,000 and under in 1959, only 35 percent of the current farmers in Brookston had sales of less than $10,000 in 1957. None of the former farmers in Shoals had gross farm sales from the last year farmed that exceeded $10,000. Twenty-nine percent of the former farmers in Brookston, however, had sales in this category for the last year they farmed. In both communities, the farmers who had relatively low gross farm sales were the ones to leave farming.

The second aspect of the capital investment impediment is the ownership status of the current and former farmers. The degree of farm ownership was not related to mobility out of farming in Shoals. But in Brookston a relationship did exist (Table 49). More of the former Brookston farmers had been tenants than full owners. In Shoals, there were as many full owners as tenants in the former farmer category. The difference between the communities may be partially explained by the small farm acreage and low machinery and building inventory characteristic of farming units in the low income area.

Implications

This study of job mobility and migration in a low income rural community has confirmed the power of Olson's model to generate fruitful operational hypotheses in mobility and migration research.

The importance of studying the total mobility process in a particular community was again shown to have substantial merit. This approach is particularly relevant to the conclusion that farmers in low income as well as high income communities experience a decline in social position when they shift to local non-farm employment.

The limitations noted in the Olson study remain and should be considered in the design of further research:

The definition of job mobility should be modified to include vertical mobility within firms as well as among firms. The intrafirm mobility which takes place when a person moves from an operator to a supervisory capacity often represents a more effective method of satisfying motives for both economic and social betterment than interfirm job mobility.

No attempt was made in this study to study migrants from the Shoals community. Comparison of behavior patterns and attitudes between migrants into and from the community is thus precluded. So are comparisons between community members who have remained in the community and those who have left.

The age group studied was restricted to individuals who entered the labor force 10 years or more before the study was initiated. As a result the behavior patterns and attitudes of part of the age groups in which mobility and migration is greatest were not included.

In Brookston, the high income rural community, limitations on job mobility and migration were primarily personal rather than environmental. Employment opportunities were expanding locally and in nearby industrial centers. In Shoals, the low income rural community, limited expansion of local employment opportunities and greater distance to expanding employment centers were superimposed on the personal factors which act to limit job mobility and migration. It would appear that the major differences in job mobility and migration patterns between the two communities can be explained by the difference in economic environment. Successful efforts to achieve either more rapid economic growth in the Shoals area or more rapid movement out of the area would be likely to result in mobility behavior more nearly like that observed in Brookston.

This study confirms the importance of education in successful mobility among communities. A disproportionate share of the migrants into Shoals were in the professional and skilled worker class. They tended to rank relatively high in social status in spite of their short residence in the community. This high status appears to rest primarily in the high occupational income which they command as a result of their special skills or training. This finding emphasized the social and economic importance of migration into as well as from rural communities.

The study also confirms Olson's finding that farmers tend to lose social status with little compensating gain in occupational income when they shift from agriculture to local non-farm employ-

ment. If this finding holds for other areas as well, it implies that successful mobility in the farm population depends on the possession of occupational and educational skills or achievements which permit successful mobility from the local rural community to larger urban industrial centers. This further emphasizes the economic importance of equalizing educational opportunities among communities of different size. It also emphasizes that vocational training should be oriented to expanding regional and national rather than local labor-markets.

The study also provided some insights into the role of part-time farming in low income areas. In the Shoals community it is not uncommon for an individual to have a full-time factory job and farm in his spare time, although many indicated that the farming provided no income. One part-time farmer commented, ". . . don't know why I'm farming, just a pastime. My father farmed all his life and I just took over. I'm not making any money, but I just can't seem to quit." To some people in Shoals, part-time farming provides an outlet for surplus family labor. For many it appears to represent a low-cost form of recreation. Although part-time farming, in this sense, is not a very remunerative undertaking, it may not be an inefficient use of labor.

Bibliography

Beshers, J. M. and E. N. Nishiura, 1961. "A Theory of Internal Migration Differential," *Social Forces* 39:214-218.

Bottum, J. C., J. O. Dunbar and J. B. Kohlmeyer, 1960. Unpublished mimeograph prepared for District Agricultural Policy Conference, Purdue University.

Hathaway, Dale E., May 1960. "Migration from Agriculture: The Historical Record and Its Meaning," *American Economic Review* L:379-391.

Hay, Donald G., 1948. "A Scale for the Measurement of Social Participation of Rural Households," *Rural Sociology* 13:285-294.

Olson, Philip G., 1960. *Job Mobility and Migration in a High Income Rural Community.* Purdue Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 708.

Smith, Eldon D., August 1956. "Non-farm Employment Information for Rural People," *Journal of Farm Economics* 38:813-827.

Sutcliff, J. P., 1957. "A General Method of Analysis of Frequency Data for Multiple Classifications Designs," *Psychological Bulletin,* vol. 54, no. 2.

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1960. *Farm Population, Estimates for 1950-59,* AMS-80, Washington, D. C.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, August 1960. *1959 Census of Agriculture Preliminary, Indiana,* GPO, Washington, D. C.

Warner, W. Lloyd, 1949. *Social Class in America,* Harper and Brothers, New York.

Appendix

Appendix Table A-1. Summary of hypotheses and findings on relationships among job mobility and migration and selected personal characteristics, advantages or limitations and personal motives in the Shoals community.[1]

Factor	Job mobility		Migration	
	Hypothesis	Finding	Hypothesis	Finding
Personal Characteristics:				
Age	—	0	—	—
Income[2]	—	0	+	+—
Social status	—	—	+	+
Education	—	0	+	+
Advantages or Limitations:				
Job knowledge	+	+	+	0
Special job skills	+	0	--	--
Capital investment	—	—	—	—
Community attachments:	—	—		
favorable attitudes			—	0
organization participation			—	0
kinship ties			—	—
Personal Motives:[3]				
Economic betterment	+	0	+	+
Social betterment	+	0	+	+

[1] Abbreviations indicate: (—) negative relationship, (+) positive relationship, (0) no significant relationship.

[2] Migrants were found to have a high or a low income.

[3] The motives were not measured directly. See the section dealing with the hypotheses, pp 5-6.

Appendix Table A-2. Summary of findings on relationships among job mobility and migration and selected personal characteristics, advantages or limitations and personal motives in the Shoals community and in the Brookston community.[1]

Factor	Job mobility		Migration	
	Shoals	Brookston	Shoals	Brookston
Personal Characteristics:				
Age	0	—	—	—
Income[2]	0	—	+	+
Social status[3]	—	—	+	+
Education	0	0	+	+
Advantages or Limitations:				
Job knowledge	+	nh	0	nh
Special job skills	0	—	nh	nh
Capital investment	—	—	—	nh
Community attachments:				
favorable attitudes	nh	nh	0	0
organization participation	nh	nh	0	0
kinship ties	nh	nh	—	—
Personal Motives:				
Economic betterment	0	+	+	+
Social betterment	0	+	+	+

[1] Abbreviations indicate: (—) negative relationship, (+) positive relationship, (0) no significant relationship, and (nh) where a relationship was not hypothesized.

[2] Shoals migrants had high or low incomes; Brookston migrants had average and high incomes.

[3] Brookston migrants had average social status.

Other Rural Area Development Studies from Purdue

Single copies of Purdue Research and Extension publications listed here are free to residents of Indiana. They may be obtained from the county extension agent or by writing to the Agricultural Publications Office, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

Factors Affecting Industrial Location in Southern Indiana, L. T. Wallace, Research Bulletin 724.

Job Mobility and Migration in a High Income Rural Community, P. G. Olson, Research Bulletin 708.

Your Community and Industrialization, L. T. Wallace, Mimeo EC-231.

Answers to Your Questions about Planning and Zoning in Indiana, J. K. McDermott and T. W. Schulenberg, Mimeo EC-208.

The Tourist-Recreation Industry—A Guide for Your Area's Development, Land Use Subcommittee of the Indiana Rural Development Committee, Mimeo EC-209.

Services Available for Your Area's Development, Agricultural Land Use Subcommittee of the Indiana Rural Development Committee (mimeo).

These reports are available from the librarian, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

A Framework for Rural Development, J. K. McDermott, Journal of Farm Economics 42:567-575 (August 1960).

The Role of the Communty as a Factor in Industrial Location, L. T. Wallace and V. W. Ruttan, Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association, 5, 1961.

Dimensions of the Depressed Area Problem, V. W. Ruttan, Department of Agricultural Economics, miscellaneous series.